HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 11 Wednesday, March 18, 1959 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN

DEFENSE: *Will Ike consult MacArthur?* ..... (page 1)

SENATE: *Behind Proxmire's rebellion* ..... (page 1)

MICHIGAN: *Exodus from bankruptcy* ..... (page 2)

GOP MALADY: *Stay-at-home voters* ..... (page 2)

CASTRO: *His war on Catholicism* ..... (page 3)

Decision at Top Level: The issue is between General Eisenhower and "General" Acheson—so runs a current wise-crack on the crucial argument about the balanced Budget and national defense.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson had presumed to criticize President Eisenhower's appropriations for the armed services. The wise-crackers were able to discredit Acheson without even recalling how Truman's Secretary of State in 1950 fumbled us into war in Korea.

Yet, even the wise-crackers concede that the Joint Chiefs of Staff today are not happy about the money they are receiving in Ike's budget for new weapons—missiles, bombers, atomic planes, *etc.* Could Ike be making a mistake at this critical juncture?

As a result of this skepticism, some on Capitol Hill suggest that there exists a higher court of decision on the burning defense issue. They wonder why the President has not turned for advice to the one man in this country of global reputation on military matters—General Douglas MacArthur. This thought drew added point last week end as a meeting of Republicans recalled the conservative stance taken by Ike on a number of issues, when he was running for the GOP Presidential nomination in June, 1952.

At his first political press conference, held in Abilene, Kansas, Ike was asked: "Would you make use of General MacArthur's military capabilities if you were elected?" Ike, in reply, stated his "tremendous respect" for MacArthur's professional capacity, and went on:

> **"If I had to have any position of great responsibility in this country there is nothing that I would allow to bar me from seeking access to the finest brains, experience that I could find on any subject of importance and if anyone with his [MacArthur's] palpable knowledge of the Far East were available I should certainly want to know what he thought." (Transcript in "The New York Times," June 6, 1952.)**

This was taken as a promise to counsel with General MacArthur. Yet Ike has never consulted MacArthur during the entire tenure of the present Administration.

Two years ago, Senator Theodore Green (D.-R.I.), then Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, sought to have MacArthur appear before his committee and give his opinion on the controversial Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East. MacArthur reportedly declined on the ground that he had no access to Government intelligence and was not sufficiently briefed to give an opinion.

Today, MacArthur—the man whom the British Chief of Imperial Staff termed "the greatest general of World War II"—might well be called in for consultation; not only because of his military genius, but also because of his well-known insistence upon fiscal solvency and Budget balancing (see article, "The Path to Freedom," by General MacArthur in HUMAN EVENTS for March 17, 1958). He might aid Ike immeasurably in resolving the controversy of Budget *vs.* defense. Given all the facts and intelligence reports, no one—it is generally agreed on Capitol Hill—could render a better verdict.

Illustrative of the confusion of the Budget-defense debate was Army Chief General Maxwell Taylor's insistence that cutting the Army by about 25,000 men might prove disastrous. Behind closed doors in executive session, Senators grilled Taylor. One asked him: "Really, General, do you mean that cutting the Army by 25,000 would bring disaster in say Korea, or the Middle East, or Germany?" Taylor squirmed, then conceded a reluctant "No."

Not Merely Gossip: Across the river in the Pentagon, General Staff sources evince much less concern than does the press about a dangerous showdown with Soviet Russia over Berlin. The generals and admirals doubt that Khrushchev wants to risk real war; but they do suspect that, under cover of talk about Berlin, the Soviets may shift the theater of controversy very quickly to the Middle East or Far East. The Pentagon has its eye especially on Iran as a likely target for the next Moscow demonstration.

● Capitol Hill is still astir over charges of nepotism against members of Congress—with most of the cases involving new "liberal" Democrats. Discovery of sons and daughters on the payroll of their father legislators at big salaries does not go down well in the constituencies. What Capitol Hill expects is that the newspaper probe of the staffs of individual members of Congress may widen. It might, for instance, reveal how many relatives of members are on the staffs of congressional committees (a very numerous sector of Capitol Hill) and of Executive agencies and departments. Quite a lot of territory might be examined, with many repercussions.

● What's behind the assault by Senator William

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Proxmire (D.-Wis.) on the power of Senate Democratic leader Lyndon Johnson? (This internecine Democratic feud has brought chuckles from Republicans.) Observers in the Senate Press gallery figure it this way: inordinate ambition of the Wisconsin Senator backed by a strong parliamentary position.

Proxmire, re-elected last November, has six more years to go and he has obtained good committee posts lasting through 1960. A vengeful Lyndon Johnson could not hurt him much in the next two years. Also, Proxmire ranks as the leading Democratic figure in his state and works in unison with the new Democratic Governor. He may well control the Wisconsin delegation to the Democratic nominating convention in 1960.

Such being the situation, Presidential hopeful Lyndon Johnson may have to court Proxmire, not *vice versa*. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the Wisconsin Senator eventually may make a deal with Johnson. What would it be? Possibly Johnson's support for Proxmire for the Vice-Presidential spot on the Democratic ticket in 1960. If Proxmire suddenly drops his criticisms of Johnson, not a few will draw the obvious conclusion.

● Democratic pow-wows and banquets in Washington recently brought together many old figures of the Roosevelt and Truman regimes. Noticed among them was Matthew J. Connelly, former aide to President Truman, who—together with another Truman aide, Lamar T. Caudle—was convicted in 1956 of conspiracy to defraud the Government in an income tax case. (This story is set forward in full in *The Truman Scandals*, by Jules Abels, published by the Henry Regnery Co.) Connelly and Caudle are at liberty while they appeal a recent court decision denying them a new trial.

Michigan Story: Scarcely a week passes without further and often novel signs of the Reuther Depression—as it is now called—in the state of Michigan. The Detroit papers in the past week have headlined stories about "caravans for Alaska." Automobile groups have been organized and one has taken off for the Kenai Peninsula in the new state of Alaska, to start life anew. The first caravan, according to latest news reports, got as far as Minnesota, but was detained by heavy snows; some stragglers were reported bogged down in Wisconsin.

Leaders of the second Detroit area caravan had a turnaway crowd last week. They commented: "We have 100 families registered to leave on June 22, but we can only take about half of them." (Detroit *Times*, March 9.) The Detroit papers term them "59ers" (recalling the 49ers who went to California a century ago), or the "new homesteaders."

This phenomenon is viewed as part of a general exodus from Michigan; and the general exodus would not have occurred if unemployment had not been rife, the business climate bad, and had not the Wolverine State failed to respond—as other states have responded—to the business recovery now going on across the Nation.

Another development starkly illustrates the results of the administration of Governor "Soapy" Williams, regarded as a puppet of Reuther's United Auto Workers union. *The Arizona Republic* (Phoenix, Ariz.) reported, March 4, that over 300 Detroit policemen have either applied by mail or in person for jobs with the Phoenix police force. The *Republic* interviewed some who had come in person and reported these Detroit policemen as saying:

"That state [Michigan] is going bankrupt. Haven't you heard about it?" "In some of the areas we patrol you see people who are on relief driving around in Cadillacs." "The word's going around that the thing to do is come to Michigan and go on relief." "There's no future for us in Michigan." (Recently, Michigan industry made advance payment of taxes to keep state government payrolls going.)

Noting this unusual development, Washington observers remark: "In short, people are leaving the greatest example of state socialism and labor-union domination for a far-off state which is the symbol of the 'right-to-work' law, damned by all the labor bosses."

The Arizona Republic, commenting on the case of the 300 Detroit policemen, editorializes: "Arizona—Phoenix, specifically—undoubtedly will benefit from this flight of policemen from Michigan by getting a group of experienced and able law officers. Arizona also can benefit by studying the causes of this mass desire to flee a state 'without a future.' Such a study should result in Arizona's avoiding the wastrel type of administration that has brought disaster so close to the Michigan government and has removed all optimism for the future from such good citizens as her officers of the law."

Depressed Areas: The Area Redevelopment Bill, currently in the hands of the House Banking and Currency Committee, last week came under heavy fire from Representative Edgar Hiestand (R.-Calif.). "The bill," he said, "provides for the creation of a new Federal bureau . . . to help 'depressed' areas needing redevelopment to expand their economic activity so as to provide jobs for the unemployed."

"Under this bill," he added, "a plant might be encouraged to move from an area with very little unemployment, to an area with more unemployment, without regard to the fact that once the plant moves, it will leave jobless workers in its wake. . . .

"It won't work," concluded the Congressman, "because it does not take into consideration the real causes of industrial underdevelopment; exhaustion of raw materials, labor conditions, local taxation, changing products and markets, and so forth. These are the natural laws of manufacturing, trade, and commerce. They can't be changed by a Federal Bureau, no matter how much money it spends."

GOP Stay-at-Homes: Two developments last week served to illustrate the thesis long propounded by professional GOP politicians battling "modern" theories of electioneering: namely, that a party wins elections by exerting maximum effort to turn out its own known vote,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather than by wooing voters on the other side of the fence.

One development was the release of a study by Senator Barry Goldwater, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee. Goldwater offered statistics to show that, throughout the Nation, the vote for GOP candidates to the House was uniformly lower in 1958 than it was in 1956—to the tune of 8.6 million votes. Even in New York, where Rockefeller won election over Averell Harriman, the total GOP Congressional vote slumped by a million votes.

Thus, where "personality" was relied upon to carry the day, the GOP as a whole was hit badly. In one state only—in Arizona, where stress was placed on principle and party organization—did the total GOP Congressional vote increase over 1956.

Pointing to the crucial area in which elections are won and lost, Goldwater's survey disclosed that the Democratic stay-at-home drop from 1956, outside the South, was only 1.7 million. In no less than 14 states (including California, Indiana, and Ohio), the vote for Democratic House candidates was actually higher in 1958 than it was in the Presidential year of 1956.

● Also pointing the get-out-your-own vote moral was the recent by-election in the Fourth District of Missouri, for the seat of the late Democratic Congressman, George H. Christopher.

In last November's election, Democrat Christopher downed his GOP opponent, 73,000 to 41,000. In this month's special election, Democratic candidate Randall beat Republican William McKee by approximately 27,500 votes to 20,000.

GOP professionals estimate the relative strength of the two parties in the Fourth District at 98,000 for the Democrats, 90,000 for the Republicans. Thus if the GOP had turned out 30,000 voters—only one-third of its potential vote—in the recent election, it would have gained an additional seat in the House of Representatives.

Behind this failure was a story of businessmen—confused over what course to take—refusing to come to the aid of a besieged GOP candidate. "When the chips were down," reported a *Wall Street Journal* correspondent on the scene, "the businessmen hereabouts just didn't want much to do with organized politics and politicking." Principally blamed for the failure of businessmen to turn out for McKee: uncertainty as to the attitude that higher-up officials in big corporations would take toward junior executives who went in for politicking. This "unwritten Hatch Act for businessmen," the *Journal* reports, is more generally blamed for the failure to participate than is the "businessman's traditional fear of losing customers through political activity."

By way of contrast, investigation on the ground in Kansas City and Independence revealed the usual vigorous performance by union forces, in behalf of the Democratic candidate. Union personnel at industrial plants asked for election day off, to work at the polls; union representatives were on hand to disseminate literature to the voters, *etc.*

GOP Policy: Conservative members of the Republican party have tossed a hot proposal to the newly named Committee of 44, designated by Chairman Meade Alcorn to redefine the policy of the GOP. The proposal is that the Committee adopt the statement of policy which the party got up in 1950 and which was highly praised by candidate Eisenhower in his first campaign for the Presidency.

The proposal may prove hot because the 1950 statement was composed by Senators Taft, Brewster, Wherry and Lodge, with the aid of Arizona Committeeman Clarence Budington Kelland (whose criticism of Ike was printed in HUMAN EVENTS for December 22, 1958). Speaking at Abilene, Kansas, June 5, 1952, Ike said (as quoted in *The New York Times* the following day):

"I find that in the Republican declaration of February 6, 1950—which was passed and supported by Republican members of the US Senate, Republican members of the US House of Representatives and the Republican National Committee—I find that so far as the principles therein are stated I am in general accord."

The proposal to adopt the 1950 declaration may prove "hot" because of such points as the following: "We support aid to those states resisting communism, but such aid should be given only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, if it is beyond the ability of the aided nation to supply for itself, and if there is a program for progressive reduction." President Eisenhower is now at odds with economy advocates in Congress, who want to cut down drastically on his foreign-aid budget.

On domestic affairs, the 1950 declaration starts off with the following: "The major domestic issue today is liberty against socialism." The document is long, but Senator Margaret Chase Smith (R.-Me.) boiled it down to 89 words, as follows: "(1) Reducing taxes; (2) Balancing the Budget; (3) Fighting deficit spending and Government waste; (4) Fighting communism here instead of complacently condoning it; (5) Making foreign policy truly bipartisan instead of merely rubber-stamped; (6) Fighting and exposing 'something-for-nothing' deception, whether it be socialized medicine, socialized farming, or hidden taxes; (7) Preventing either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public; (8) Maintaining an adequate social security system that does not limit opportunity or discourage initiative and saving; (9) Opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits; (10) Smashing the filibuster on civil rights."

The Castro Story: After a brief period of turmoil and uncertainty, Americans are now beginning to get the true picture of Fidel Castro's revolutionary regime in Cuba. Biggest jolt to pro-Castro forces in the US came last week when Dale Francis, influential columnist in the Catholic weekly, *Our Sunday Visitor*, struck out at the Cuban dictator.

Francis, who has been sympathetic to Castro, declared last week that the Cuban leader had betrayed the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people of Cuba, and that he was putting his rebel forces through compulsory courses in Marxism. Moreover, Francis observed, Castro is indulging in vehement anti-American and anti-Catholic propaganda. Castro, he said, "has already dismissed virtually every Catholic chaplain with the rebel army in the mountains."

Just returned from a tour of Cuba, Francis said that Castro's regime swarmed with pro-Communists, and predicted: "Cuba is heading for worse dictatorship than under Batista. . . . The country will be under virtual Communist domination . . . Cuba is faced with economic ruin. . . . "

● In a similar statement, *The Wanderer*, a national Catholic publication published in St. Paul, Minn., voiced its skepticism about Castro—who had been the object of favorable attention in much of the Catholic press. *The Wanderer* asked: "What about the Castro decree to suspend for two years the rights of Catholic university students to practice their respective professions, simply because . . . 'it was not right for private university students to continue their studies at a time when students of the state universities had left their books to take up arms against the Batista dictatorship'?"

● The continuing story of Castro's reign of terror confirms the reports carried by HUMAN EVENTS on the morrow of the Cuban revolution (see issue of January 14, 1959). And with fresh reports of rebel atrocities comes the news that Castro will visit Washington next month, to address the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Learning of this invitation, and of the accompanying agitation to have Castro received at the White House, Congressman James C. Davis (D.-Ga.) last week fired off this sharp rebuke:

"Who is trying to maneuver whom into the obligation of inviting Castro officially? Apparently somebody is trying to sneak Castro into the back door of the White House. . . . Castro has nothing to commend him to patriotic Americans. He deserves no preferential treatment from us and could certainly be kept out as an undesirable alien."

Hawaiian Statehood: Opening its gates to Hawaiian statehood, the United States ignored the powerful position occupied there by pro-Communist union leader Harry Bridges. Such was the warning of Representative John R. Pillion (R.-N.Y.), uttered before the House Rules Committee in an unsuccessful last-ditch effort to prevent the Pacific islands from being brought into the Union. (The bill also swept through the Senate last week with 15 Southern Democrats and one unswerving Republican — John Marshall Butler of Maryland — voting against it.)

Much of the anti-statehood testimony offered by Pillion, Representative Walter Rogers (D.-Tex.) and Representative James C. Davis (D.-Ga.) focused on the Communist-controlled Longshoremen's and United Public Workers Union operating on Hawaii—both of which are headed by the notorious Harry Bridges. These unions were expelled by the CIO in 1950 because "their policies follow the Communist party." Pillion said that communism in Hawaii, centered in the two unions, "continues to influence every phase of territorial activity to an alarming degree."

Ironically, statehood for Hawaii passed its last major hurdle (the House Rules Committee) on the very day that it was disclosed that Bridges had been subpenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to answer questions regarding anti-American statements reportedly made by him during a recent tour of the Soviet Union.

Book Event: Out this week is a new book by Frank Chodorov, HUMAN EVENTS Contributing Editor. Entitled *The Rise and Fall of Society* (Devin-Adair $3.95), the book is a virtual compendium of libertarian thought, ranging over the moral, economic and historic arguments for freedom. Key to Chodorov's philosophy is chapter four—"Society Are People." The individual, Chodorov argues, is prior to the social group, which should exist only through him and for him. "The concept of the Society as a metaphysical person," he says, "falls flat when we observe that Society disappears when component parts disperse; as in the case of a 'ghost town' or of a civilization we learn about by the artifacts they left behind." This volume is a worthy successor to the author's previous books, *One is a Crowd* and *The Income Tax: Root of All Evil.*

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

CLERGYMEN PRAISE HUMAN EVENTS

REV. O. B. THOMAS, Main Street Methodist Church, New Albany, Ind.: "HUMAN EVENTS should be in the hands of every minister in America."

JAMES COSBEY, JR., Pastor, Church of The Holy Spirit, Milton, Mass.: "I look forward to the coming of HUMAN EVENTS each week, and feel that it gives an excellent evaluation of current trends and events."

RUSSELL P. NELSON, Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Balaton, Minn.: "I enjoy HUMAN EVENTS very much. Helps tremendously to get the news behind the news. I read it and pass it on to others."

ROBERT A. VAN LEW, Pastor, Fork Christian Church, Fork, Maryland: "I certainly appreciate receiving HUMAN EVENTS. With such a limited amount of time, I feel that I am reading about what really matters."

OSWALD SKOV, Pastor, First Lutheran Church, San Fernando, Calif.: "HUMAN EVENTS gives us the chief issues in a capsule. Just what we need. Thanks."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 11 HUMAN EVENTS March 18, 1959
Article Section Printed in Two Sections

The Challenge to Conservatives

By RAYMOND MOLEY and RAYMOND MOLEY, JR.

I. WHAT HAPPENED NOVEMBER 4, 1958

As election returns streamed in across the country through the November hours last fall, what the authors had anticipated became an accomplished fact. Like the implacable rise of a floodtide, swelled by important tributaries and the outpouring of mighty forces, setting new and alarming high-water marks, the Democratic-labor coalition increased.

Election day, 1958, may well be remembered as the date when the political force of organized labor achieved substantially what it had, for two decades, been striving for—majority representation in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, as well as virtual control of many houses of state legislatures, by those who had received its endorsement and benefitted from its political action.

The political talents of organized labor had been multiplied to a point where they were a major influence in American politics. What they accomplished was clear in all parts of the country and is perhaps most graphically shown in the composition of the United States Senate.

Preliminary research concerning the new Senate reveals a clear majority's identity with the ideas and aspirations of the AFL-CIO's national political machine, the Committee on Political Education. This majority is called "the Liberal Lineup" by labor publications. It is predominantly Democratic, consisting of a huge block of Northern Democrats, an increased number of "liberal" Southern Democrats —in accord with COPE in all things save "civil rights"—and a handful of Republican followers.

For the US Senate, union political action backed 25 of 32 winners in 1958. This has changed the "Liberal Lineup" from a strong minority to a majority.

To show this majority's accord with the policies and purposes of COPE, a measuring stick of COPE specifications may be used. As in past campaigns, COPE in 1958 distributed through its state and local organizations millions of copies of "How Your Senators and Representatives Voted, 1957-58." This tabulation lists 16 Senate and 13 House roll calls which COPE regards as a test of fealty to its objectives. Each Senator and Representative is listed and scored "Right" or "Wrong" according to COPE precepts. Roughly two-thirds of the issues are not concerned with labor matters but deal with a broad national program and comprise an identifiable political creed.

Twelve Democratic Senators who are to continue in the next Congress had perfect scores. Five deviated only once from COPE's position. Fifteen are regarded as "acceptable" to COPE, since they differed only from two to four times. This is a total of 32 Democratic Senators.

Five of the 15 freshman Democratic Senators served in the House, where they compiled heavy COPE scores in the 1956 or 1958 COPE publication or both. On general knowledge, including AFL-CIO support in the recent campaign, at least seven of the remaining nine will vote the COPE line (the labor press claims all of them). Hence, 44 Democratic Senators may be expected to vote along the lines of the COPE platform.

Let us turn to the records of Republican Senators who have voted the COPE line and are with us in the present Congress. There are seven whom COPE regards as reliable, having deviated only two to four times. Of the three new Republican Senators, two have met COPE standards in the House of Representatives. Thus, COPE may expect a total of 53 usually reliable votes.

The triumph of COPE's political strategy is reflected in the rail unions' national weekly, *Labor*: "A key fact to hold in mind is that the liberal majority in Congress remains a slim one. In the past Congress, 180 members of the House out of 435 and 43 senators out of 96 voted 'Right' for the public interest on three-fifths or more of the key issues tabulated by the AFL-CIO. These, roughly speaking, might be called the liberals. In the last Congress they were still a minority. In the new Congress, nearly all these liberals will be back again. In addition, nearly all the new faces will be liberal ones, replacing conservatives for the most part. On balance it seems likely that around 220 or 225 House members and about 53 or 54 Senators will be found usually in the liberal camp in the new Congress."

THERE ARE EVEN greater dimensions to this impressive picture on Capitol Hill. They are found in the halls of convening legislatures and in the Governors' mansions of many states. In November, union leaders could boast "heavy liberal victories in state legislatures [which are] important to labor." And union forces backed 17 of 23 successful candidates for Governor.

COPE explains in the official labor publication, *AFL-CIO News*, that owing to COPE's general though not exclusive backing of Democrats, "In three states—California, Connecticut and Ohio—they [the Democrats] won both houses of the legislature from the Republicans. In five other states where they previously had only one house, they now control both houses. And in eight states, they captured one house of a previously all-Republican legislature. In no state did they lose control."

Republicans and conservatives alike may take grim warning from any of the following figures. Republicans lost nearly 700 seats in state legisla-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tures in 1958. They have lost more than 1000 since 1952. Whereas Republicans controlled both houses of legislatures in 26 states six years ago, they now control both in only seven, one less than in 1936. In 1952 there were 30 Republican Governors; today there are 14.

To derive meaning from these formidable statistics, the dual nature of the 1958 election must be recognized. On the one hand, it was a prodigious achievement by a virile, hard-working, determined, and politically astute minority. On the other, it was a stunning defeat of a conservative majority which was lacking in all things that the minority had in abundance.

The 1958 election was not another 1932 or 1936. A deep trough of depression cannot be blamed. Nor did the "liberals" have a politician of Franklin D. Roosevelt's luster heading the Democratic party. While unemployment in certain areas and a decline of business activity were factors, these cannot explain the extent of the conservative defeat.

Second, it cannot be implied that the Democrats received a great mandate from the people as they did in the early Roosevelt years and as did the Republicans in 1952.

In a word, the major factor that won the political field for the "Liberal Lineup" was *organization.*

II. THE TECHNIQUES OF VICTORY

What HUMAN EVENTS has noted for a long time has been reinforced in the 1958 campaign and election. The alliance of the Democratic party and the unions' political-action forces is stronger and more cohesive than ever.

Organized labor, especially the CIO, has for nearly two decades demonstrated a capacity to engage in political work, since union organization and discipline are quite adaptable to the rigors of ward, precinct and block work. Union treasuries suffered none of the restrictions imposed upon corporations until the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947. Then it became only a matter of charging to "education and citizenship" expenditures for most activities which are customarily the most essential tasks of political parties. The PAC of the CIO, the AFL's counterpart, and many lesser political-action groups of various unions thus continued to use the memberships' general funds to advance the political fortunes of the "Liberal Lineup." Above all, there was the driving zest among labor leaders for the things that may be gained in politics.

BUT TO DESIGNATE the "liberal" and dominant wing of the Democratic party a "Labor" or "Socialist" party is an ineffective way of conveying the real situation to the public. Both Democratic party figures (an increasing number of whom come from the labor movement) and union leaders will disclaim such labels. It is understandable that Walter Reuther, George Meany and other union officials desire to avoid the name "Labor party" while achieving the substance through a venerable and established party. Furthermore, the American people will not believe such a characterization.

Yet by the alliance with the Democratic party and the assumption of its political tasks, the unions' political leaders have profited by an old trade name. They have profited by the votes of many who cast their ballots for that party because of long-established tradition, and others who are unable to comprehend what is happening to their party.

In recent years the Democratic party has delegated more and more of its authority and responsibilities to its powerful ally. Conscientious application to its allotted tasks over these years assured organized labor of notable gains before and after the Eisenhower sweep of 1952. By 1956 union politicians had learned a good many lessons and profited accordingly. They had learned from reversals. For example, the severe rebuff suffered in 1950 in Ohio when they viciously attacked Taft with local and out-of-state forces taught them to be more discreet.

Most important, they learned that political victories are fashioned by workers in city blocks and precincts. Candidates for local and state office as well as for Congress must receive adequate attention. Getting a heavy vote for endorsed candidates for local office almost invariably helps approved candidates for higher office.

In 1954 the unions clearly indicated their power by winning for the Democratic party control of both houses of Congress. Twenty-one House seats were switched from Republican to Democratic while only four Democratic and one independent went Republican. In the net of 16, political action of unions was decisive in 10 or 12. Moreover, control of the Senate was changed by the victories of Neuberger and McNamara, both decisively backed by union forces and funds.

Going into 1956 there appeared in union headquarters throughout the country a manual of directions, issued by COPE, called *How to Win.* It is the most readable text on practical politics to appear in many years, giving detailed instructions on such things as setting up an organization, training and encouraging workers, campaigning at the block level, getting people registered and to the polls, rewarding volunteers, etc. A second publication of great importance in 1956 was the compilation of voting records. Fifteen million copies were given wide distribution, reaching every union member and his family.

WHEN COPE ROLLED in 1956 it was with extreme mobility, over state lines into strategic districts, often striking for Senate and House seats where union activity was least expected. Paid workers concealed their identity with unions when they rang doorbells, saying something like, "I'm a Democrat and I'd like you to read this literature and vote for so-and-so."

The more politically minded unions were able to throw thousands upon thousands of workers into the job of mobilizing the vote, and it was estimated that they were able to put 100,000 cars on the streets election day.

Michigan's Democratic party had long since been a CIO party. In 1956 Oregon, Maine, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and California, among many others, were subjected to COPE's big guns.

California is a vivid example of how successful the Democrats' giant ally can be. The Republican party's position in the state appeared as sound as a block of reinforced concrete when its national convention convened in San Francisco in 1956. The party had control of the state legislature, the Governor's mansion, two US senators, 19 of the state's 30 House members, and illustrious figures in exalted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

office—Nixon, Knowland and Warren. Its national ticket had swept the state with 700,000 votes to spare in 1952.

But forces were at work to smash this supremacy. Early warnings were already appearing. Republican congressional candidates in 1948 had received 59.4 per cent of the vote; but in 1952, despite the Eisenhower triumph, that percentage fell off to 54 per cent, and in 1956, when Ike was again piling up a huge majority, the percentage was to drop to 46.8.

COPE's thousands were at the bottom of this erosion of Republican supremacy—persuading and cajoling Democratic voters to register themselves, their families and their neighbors, working side-by-side with Democratic party officials and workers at all political levels, coaching candidates in speech-making and letter-writing, blanketing whole districts with propaganda from state and national headquarters and, on election day, checking on sympathetic voters, telephoning, canvassing blocks and precincts by automobile and shoe-leather, watching the polls, and even providing baby-sitters while wives went to cast their ballots.

Then came a long, two-year offensive, climaxed last November with COPE-backed Democrats winning the Governorship, one US Senate seat, and three House seats to gain a majority of California's congressional delegation, 16-14. Democrats also seized control of both the state senate and assembly by large margins—26-13 and 47-33 respectively. Republican difficulties in California merely made the inevitable more substantial.

Techniques used in California are applied from one end of the country to the other. Officials and shop stewards of many unions regard political work as part of their job, and at registration and election times they have thousands of paid workers and volunteers, trained in precinct work.

Finally, throughout the year scores of union newspapers and journals reach entire memberships. They are mailed to workers' homes where they will reach the wives and, perhaps, guests. Content is therefore tailored for the housewife as well as the member. These publications are devoted in large part to political matters—office-holders and candidates, the political parties and issues, and, during election years, appeals for contributions for direct support of candidates in Federal elections (the only item which must be reported under Taft-Hartley) and on occasion for the Democratic National Committee. Always there is the message, implied or pronounced, that politics and government should be of concern to every union member.

III. HOW TO MEET THE 'LIBERAL' CHALLENGE

Attack on Labor-in-Politics?

There are serious abuses in the unions' political activity, and they should be eliminated by legal means. The use of the general funds to support candidates and parties should be stopped. So far as Federal elections are concerned, this is illegal, and the law should be enforced.

But even if these things were done, the amazing political efficiency of the unions in getting out their vote would remain formidable. So we must seek political balance by activating every possible element in the voting population by the most effective methods possible. Merely to bewail labor's activity and denounce it will not be effective.

In the realm of human endeavor there is a common need to return now and then to fundamentals and to beginnings. The farmer must periodically plow up his fields, revive the land, and replant. The businessman finds occasions when he must replace obsolete machinery or bring new methods to his operation. Even in our national pastime a manager must cut and add to his squad, verse his players in the fundamentals of the game—batting, fielding, *etc.*—and work out new strategies.

LIKEWISE THERE COME times in our political life when we must go back to fundamentals. Let us grasp this fundamental, once and for all: the individual should be the center of our concern. The state exists for him. The group, whatever it may be, is merely a cluster of individuals seeking what they conceive to be in their interests. But politics has forgotten the individual and makes its pitch for the group. We must turn from that tendency and focus on the individual. The individual forms the community; the communities form the state. So let us turn to the individual in his community and start from there. For the community is where political life is generated. It is not where laws are made, but it *is* where lawmakers are made.

The means by which the individual, through his community, controls and directs government is the political party. And we have, as has Great Britain, found the most perfect liberty and stable government through a two-party system.

A Third Party?

There are those conservatives who believe that neither of the two old parties can serve their interests. They say that since this is true they should protest by rallying a minority in a third, conservative party. They reason quite sincerely that this might hold a balance of power and force one or the other of the old parties toward a more conservative course. This would be fine if there were years of time to borrow for the process. But there is no such leisurely course before us. A third, conservative party would simply draw votes from that party which now holds the most promise of a conservative stand. Thus, elections would be forfeited to the "liberal"-labor coalition. And in the few years ahead this might so undermine the American economic and political system as to bring us to a very real point of no return. Let us rather do what we can, with what we have, here and now.

Rehabilitating the Republican Party

The Republican National Committee has recently put forward a promising program for party reconstruction and increased efficiency. But the National Committee is essentially a service organization, having no authority over the many, many state and local units of the party.

Republican strength must come from these state and local organizations. Instead of sitting around and complaining about the National Committee or the President, every local unit must rebuild on its own level. It should emphasize professionalism with certain year-around, paid officials. The training of these leaders should encompass all details of political work, down to the most humble detail. In turn,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these men and women should train volunteers for systematic, vigorous precinct work. Selection and development of attractive candidates, too, have a definite place at the local level.

The Auxiliary Group

Ideally, everyone should become a member of a party organization and work for its success. But there are millions who simply will not do so. This is where the auxiliary comes in. In a great many communities auxiliary groups must be formed to work in getting people activated politically who are not regular party members. Such an auxiliary may take an innocuous name like "Good Government League" or perhaps no name at all. Its members may even call themselves "independents."

Such auxiliary groups should work closely with the more conservative party, faction or candidate. Above all, they should not antagonize the regular party people. Instead, their job should be to help with money and manpower, particularly during campaigns. This is what the "Republican Associates" in Los Angeles have done with marked success.

The Responsibility of Businessmen and Businesswomen

Never before have businessmen and business organizations been so aware of the necessity that they take a more active interest in politics. They have been so neglectful of their political responsibilities that they have permitted the labor-liberal people to use them as whipping boys and to mark them as political untouchables. But in recent months more individuals among them as well as corporations and trade associations have prepared or are preparing political action programs.

At the moment it is clear that many corporations, trade associations and businessmen generally are vividly aware of the consequences of their neglect of political responsibilities. They know that they must bestir themselves and that they possess collectively the managerial talents essential to change the national political picture. Some have done a lot of thinking about ways and means, and some have programs either in fact or in plans. We believe that we are stating the essentials of their best thinking in the following conclusions:

1. *Railing at labor for its participation in politics denies the essential truth that all Americans should try to influence their Government. From a practical standpoint it merely gives politically minded labor leaders more pretexts for charging that business is anti-labor and serves to unite union leaders and stiffen their efforts.*

2. The responsibility of businessmen in political life is not to create a pro-business party or movement. It is a constructive objective to create a better and more vital citizenship generally.

3. *The place where political action is needed is at the local level—in thousands of communities of the Nation where Representatives in Congress and state legislators are elected.*

4. To energize, to encourage, and to further political activity, including contributions to a political party, the corporation with a nation-wide business can, and should, first make clear to all members of the corporate body—employees at all levels, including management, dealers and workers, and stockholders—their responsibility to promote a healthy government with a strong two-party system. This embraces the dissemination of information by the corporation concerning the methods by which the individual can make himself effective in community affairs, including politics.

It should then (a) remove restrictions, now present in many corporations, upon political activity; (b) encourage, not compel, such participation in all levels of management; and (c) make known to all the individuals upon whom its existence and progress depends, including customers, what its interest is in current legislative issues.

Beyond this the corporation should not and, probably under the law, may not, go. But since the corporation has its legal existence under the law to serve the needs of the Nation and its communities, since it draws its income from the Nation's citizens, it has a civic as well as an economic responsibility to do no less than what is enumerated above.

5. *The exact form and methods of civic and political activity at the community level must be of a do-it-yourself nature. Each community will present its own problems, and the pattern of activity must be adjusted to them.*

The Forgotten Majority

The great majority of adult Americans are members of no group concerned with political action, be it a labor union or a political party. William Graham Sumner had in mind in his essay "The Forgotten Man" the individual of this majority who "delves away in patient industry . . . he works, generally he prays—but he always pays . . . he gives no trouble . . . he is not in any way a hero . . . or a problem . . . nor a burden . . . nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments . . . Therefore he is forgotten."

Moreover, he has no leadership—no one to rally those who share his interests for the work of shaping the kind of Government which in the long future will serve the interests of his children. This leadership must be provided. It should not be pro-labor or pro-business or pro-any-special-interest. It should be simply be "pro" a sound and stable republic.

A more detailed statement of the subject of this article is contained in a booklet entitled "The Political Responsibility of Businessmen." Single copies can be obtained without charge, and additional copies are available at a nominal price. Address: Raymond Moley, 152 West 42nd Street, New York 36, New York.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE CHALLENGE TO CONSERVATIVES" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED